

Volume 24



IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

PROCESSED

MAY 02 2002

GTU LIBRARY

January 2002

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

Editor:

REV PROFESSOR J. C. MCCULLOUGH
Union Theological College
26 College Green, Belfast BT7 1LN
☎: [44] 028 90 20 50 81
Email: jc.mccullough@union.ac.uk

Associate Editor:

REV. PROFESSOR ERNEST BEST
13 Newmill Gardens
St. Andrews KT16 8RY

Assistant Editor:

MRS SANDRA MCKINNEY
Union Theological College
26 College Green, Belfast BT7 1LN

Editorial Advisory Panel:

REV. PAUL FLEMING
REV. PRINCIPAL JAMES HAIRE
REV. DR. DAVID HILL
REV. D. P. KER
DR. J.G. McCONVILLE
REV. DR. R.J. MCKELVEY
PROFESSOR E. NICHOLSON
REV. PROFESSOR J. C. O'NEILL
MR DAVID PAYNE

Subscriptions:

Individuals: £9.00 Sterling
Institutions: £14.00 Sterling / \$30.00 US / 35 Euro

All subscriptions should be made payable to:
"Irish Biblical Studies" and addressed to the Editor.

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

VOLUME 24, JANUARY 2002

CONTENTS

- | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------|
| David Abernathy | Christ as Life-giving Spirit in 1 Corinthians 15:45 | 2-13 |
| A.Q.Morton | Codex Sinaiticus re-visited | 14-31 |
| J.C. O'Neill | "This is my body..."
(1 Corinthians 11.24) | 32-43 |

Book Reviews

The Divine Drama: The Old Testament as Literature, The Lutterworth Press, Cambridge, 2001, pp800 (pbk) [Clare Amos]; James R. Nieman and Thomas G. Rogers, *Preaching to Every Pew: Cross-Cultural Strategies*. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001) [Denis Campbell]. 44-48

Christ as Life-giving Spirit in 1 Corinthians 15:45

David Abernathy

Abstract

In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul tells his readers that because Christ corresponds in a significant way to Adam as the progenitor of a race his resurrection is a foretaste of the believer's own. Paul's assertion in v.45 that "as Adam became a living soul, Christ became a life-giving spirit," means that by virtue of his resurrection Christ now has a supernatural, spiritual body in the heavenly realm and is able not only to impart new life to the believer, but also to grant the believer a heavenly or spiritual resurrected body in which that life will be lived eternally.

The incarnation and Paul's Adam-Christ paradigm

The first generation of Christians was profoundly gripped by the concept of the incarnation, the mystery of how a holy God took on human form to save sinful humanity. We find hints of this awe throughout the New Testament epistles, especially in certain short, rhetorically balanced expressions, possibly taken from sermons, creeds or hymns, that communicate fundamental beliefs by way of contrasting two elements in very compacted form.¹ Themes that are set in antithetical contrast are: flesh and spirit, divinity and humanity, the eternal and the temporal, the immortal and the mortal, life and death, holiness and sinfulness, salvation and destruction, humiliation and exaltation, incarnation and glorification, and Christ's crucifixion and resurrection. These are found in such

¹ Gaffin, *Resurrection and Redemption* (78), comments that the semantic function of words, phrases and even clauses in this section of 1 Corinthians 15 is governed by their place in the *contrast* that is running through these verses.

passages as Rom. 1:3–4, Rom. 4:5, Rom. 14:8–9, 2 Cor 5:14–15, 2 Cor 5:21, 2 Cor 8:9, 2 Cor 13:4, Gal 2:19–20a, Gal 4:4–5, 1 Thess 5:10, 1 Tim. 3:16, 2 Tim. 2:11–13, 1 Pet 1:20, 2:24, 3:18–19, and others.² In Romans 5 and 1 Corinthians 15 Paul also delves into similar kinds of issues, but in a much more protracted expository form. In these two passages, in which he develops his Adam-Christ paradigm, Paul reflects on what it means that Christ took on human flesh, and not only experienced the pain, temptations and death that human beings experience, but did so as a proxy-representative of humanity, another Adam as it were, and able in that role to redeem those who are his by faith.

Paul's Adam-Christ paradigm posits two natures on the two sides of the comparison. Christ is described as "spirit" or as "spiritual," a topic to which we will turn in the next section. Adam is described as "natural" or ψύχικος, a word that is a cognate of the word ψύχη, or "soul." Adam, whose body was ψύχικος or natural, became a living soul when God breathed the breath of life into him. All who are "in" Adam, that is, all human beings, have the kind of life that is derived from Adam. There are two aspects to this life; by virtue of creation, it is life, and corresponds to God as having been made in his image. It was also "natural" in that it was not supernatural; as in its origin, so also in its continuance his life depended on God. Then because of the fall, it also became mortal in the sense of having become subject to death.³ When Christ took on human existence he took on a body and an existence that was natural in the sense that it was not immortal, though he was without sin. As Adam's only true successor, he reversed the course that Adam took and thereby reversed the consequences of the fall for those who are subsumed in him. He lived and ministered in the power of the Spirit and by virtue

² Abernathy, "Translating 1 Peter 3:18–22," 31–32; Martin, 236.

³ Gaffin, *Resurrection and Redemption* (82), says that even before the fall Adam's somatic existence seems to be pointing to another, higher form of somatic existence, by virtue of the creation of his "psychical" body, and not because of sin.

of his atoning death and resurrection became the endower of the Spirit for the believing humanity he represents.

Christ and Spirit

Gaffin has said that Christ's death and resurrection form the center of Paul's theology, and that his statements in 1 Cor 15:42-49 open up a perspective that is "without parallel in his writings in terms of its cosmic and history-encompassing scope."⁴ He also contends that the statement in v.45 that the last Adam became a life-giving spirit is critical to understanding Paul's Christology and pneumatology and his understanding of the relation between the Holy Spirit and Christ in his glorified state. For Paul, there is no activity of the Holy Spirit in the believer that is not also Christ's activity, and vice versa, and no relationship with Christ that is not also fellowship with the Spirit.⁵ But in order to understand what Paul may mean by saying that the last Adam "became a life-giving spirit" we must consider the semantic range of the term "spirit." We must also examine what is at stake in asserting that Christ "became" anything, because such a notion may challenge how we deal with the concept of the immutability of God as it relates to the deity of Christ. Finally we should consider what Paul is saying about Christ's relation to the Holy Spirit and what that relation means to the believer.

A. The semantic range of πνεῦμα "spirit"

The term πνεῦμα "spirit" is used in a variety of ways in the New Testament. It can refer to the innermost character (1 Peter 3:4), to spiritual beings such as angels or demons, to the realm of the supernatural (1 Tim 3:16, 1 Peter 3:18), or most often to the person and power of the Holy Spirit. Unfortunately, there are times when the boundary between one aspect of the semantic range and another is blurred. For example, when John the Baptist is said to have come in the spirit and power of Elijah, does that mean that he, like Elijah,

⁴ Gaffin, "Life-giving spirit," 575.

⁵ Gaffin, *ibid.*, 584.

is anointed and empowered by the spirit of God, or that his disposition and nature are like Elijah's, or possibly both? And when Peter says that Christ was put to death in the flesh and made alive in the spirit, does he mean made alive *by* the spirit, or with reference to the spiritual realm as opposed to the realm of the flesh? When Paul says in 1 Cor 5:3-4 that he is present with the Corinthians "in spirit" to judge the incestuous man, does he mean that somehow the Holy Spirit reinforces Paul's verdict, or that he and the Corinthians have a common bond in the spiritual realm, or simply that he will be thinking about them?

Likewise, when Paul says that Christ became a life-giving spirit, does he mean that Christ became an immaterial spirit as opposed to being a flesh and blood human? Does he intend perhaps to associate him in the fullest way possible with the person and work of the Holy Spirit? Or does he mean that Christ now has a supernatural existence in the spiritual realm which includes a supernatural body? Paul is not splitting hairs semantically here, and it should be recognized that in the short, rhetorically balanced statements referred to in the previous section our primary exegetical focus needs to be on the *contrasts* presented. Consequently we should give less consideration than we otherwise would to other elements, including prepositions, case relations, and even semantic precision of the words involved. With that in view, I would contend that in v.45 Paul primarily means that Jesus now exists bodily in a supernatural existence in the realm of the spirit, that is, a spiritual mode of existence in heaven, but also that everything about that existence is in such full harmony with the Holy Spirit that Christ and the Spirit are functionally though not ontologically identified. In other words, Jesus, the second Adam, who has existed in this world in a human body, now exists in the heavenly realm in a glorified and supernatural human body, and that all he is and does is communicated to the church as the body of Christ through the Holy Spirit, who is known as the Spirit of God as well as the Spirit of Christ.

This means that it is not Paul's intent in v.45 to say that Christ became a spirit; rather, it is the *contrast* between "soul" and "spirit" that provides the key to understanding what he is saying. Paul is contrasting the ψυχικός or natural existence of the first Adam with

the πνευμάτικος or supernatural existence of the second Adam. The first Adam is ψυχικός (that is, “soulish” and “natural”), which means that his life is animated by the soul (ψύχη) for existence in this natural world. Adam’s body is not supernatural, so it dies and is subject to corruption or decay. The second Adam is now described in terms of πνεῦμα “spirit,” which stands in contrast to ψύχη, the soul which characterizes the natural life. But the contrast is not just that of soul and spirit, but of that which is living as opposed to that which is life-giving. For Adam, to be “living” means to have received the totality of his existence from God who gives life, but to be “life-giving” of course means to be God, who alone is the life-giver. The contrast between Adam and Christ is therefore a contrast between that which is natural and mortal on the one hand, and that which is supernatural and divine on the other. It is the difference between mortal man and immortal God.

B. “Becoming” and immutability

Paul is not teaching adoptionism when he describes Christ’s “becoming” a life-giving spirit any more than he is doing so in Rom 1:3-4 where he says that Christ was appointed (ὁρισθέντος) son of God in power through his resurrection from the dead.⁶ He is not saying that Christ became a spirit; he is saying that *the second Adam*, the human being who is also the eternal son of God, experienced a dynamic change through his resurrection, and as a man who has died and who has been resurrected now has a supernatural somatic existence that no one else in all eternity has ever experienced. He is God who became human and who died as a human, now existing in a *human body* that has been resurrected to a glorious state and condition. A man, once having a body that was ψυχικός now has a body that is πνευμάτικος. Rom 1:3-4 can be seen in a similar way; although he was always the Son of God, Christ incarnate (“descended from David,” i.e., as a man) died and

⁶ Many English versions translate ὁρισθέντος as “designated” or “declared (to be),” but this word is not used in this sense anywhere else in the NT. “Appointed” is the normal usage and should be retained.

was raised to life, and by virtue of his resurrection from the dead was appointed to be the son-of-God-in-power.⁷ That is, just as his physical existence as son of David in v.3 has an historical beginning, so also his enthronement in heaven as the descendant of David who became the son-of-God-in-power – with due emphasis on the phrase “in power” – has an historical beginning, which is the resurrection.⁸ In Romans Paul goes to great lengths to explain his gospel, which he describes as being for “the Jew first and also for the Gentile,” and his description of Christ as the subject of the gospel is spelled out in terms of the same Jew-Gentile contrast. Christ is validated as Messiah to the Jews by virtue of his descent from David at the incarnation, but his validation as savior for the whole world is that he has become the-son-of-God-in-power through the event of the resurrection from the dead, a fact that is testified to by the Holy Spirit (κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης, “according to the spirit of holiness”). As Moo has commented, in Rom 1:3-4 Paul is dealing with the transition to a new era in salvation history in which Jesus has moved from being the earthly Messiah (with respect to his life in the realm of the flesh) to reigning as the life-giving son of God, powerfully active to bring salvation to all who believe.⁹

The language Paul uses in 1 Cor 15:45 (ἐγένετο “became”) could be misconstrued as adoptionism if we do not grasp his overall Christology. He is saying that just as something unique, and to an extent incomprehensible, happened in time as well as eternity at the incarnation, so also something unique happened in time and in eternity at the resurrection. In both events Christ *became* something.

⁷ Psalm 2, a messianic psalm, speaks of the Davidic king becoming God’s son (v.7) and then ruling the nations of the earth (the Gentiles) as God’s regent. No doubt Paul had that passage in mind as he wrote Rom 1:3-5, which speaks of the son of God becoming the son of David through the incarnation (v.3), then being appointed the son-of-God-in-power through the resurrection (v.4), and whom Paul now calls the Gentiles to obey (v.5).

⁸ Murray, 9.

⁹ Moo, 50.

In his incarnation he left the eternal spiritual plane and became man, laying aside his divine power and dignity, and taking upon himself the poverty and indignity of human form; he was God-in-the-flesh.¹⁰ At his resurrection he did not just return to the same state and condition which he enjoyed before his incarnation; he is now God-in-the-flesh-having-been-raised-from-the-dead. And by virtue of his resurrection (and ascension) he now has what he did not previously have, which is a glorified humanity.¹¹

As Dunn puts it, a theology which takes the *εγένετο* of John 1:14 seriously must deal just as seriously with the *εγένετο* of 1 Cor 15:45. Both events were changes of eschatological scope.¹² Gaffin says that by the experience of the resurrection "Jesus was and remains a changed man in the truest and deepest – in fact, eschatological – sense."¹³ But if we take the divinity of Christ seriously, which Paul obviously does, we must at least consider how the doctrine of divine immutability is to be understood theologically with respect to the dramatic changes which would have occurred at Christ's incarnation and resurrection. Perhaps a partial answer to that question would be that the doctrine of divine immutability means that God's essential being and character do not change, and he cannot be changed by something outside himself, against his will as it were. Christ's incarnation and resurrection were a changes of a different sort, not of character nor a compromise of his deity, and were both acts of God initiated by God. Viewed in this light it is not inconsistent to hold to the full deity of Christ as did the NT writers and the historic Christian creeds while still acknowledging the great mystery of what occurred in the incarnation and resurrection.

¹⁰ Augustine said of Christ that "while remaining God, he who made man took manhood." That is, he became what he never was while remaining what he always had been (*Homilies in John*, Tractate 17, ch. 7).

¹¹ Gaffin, "Life-giving spirit," 582.

¹² Dunn, 139.

¹³ Gaffin, "Life-giving spirit," 581.

C. 1 Cor 15:45 and Christ's relation to the Holy Spirit

It was stated above that Paul's statement that Christ "became a life-giving spirit" means that Christ now exists in human, bodily form in the spiritual realm, and is therefore able to give that same kind of supernatural bodily existence to those who are united with him. But that understanding does not exclude a reference to the Holy Spirit. In 2 Cor 3:17 Paul is willing to make the statement "the Lord is the Spirit," a statement that associates Christ (if "Lord" in v.17 refers to Christ) and the Holy Spirit so closely that they are identified as being the same, at least in some sense. But what is that sense? Obviously Paul is not saying that Christ "is" the Holy Spirit; he is free to use the verb "to be" in an associative sense, just as he does in 1 Cor. 10:4 when he says that the rock that "followed" the Israelites in the wilderness "was" Christ. I suspect that the exegetical value of Paul's statement in 2 Cor 3:17 for interpreting 1 Corinthians 15:45 is not very great. While Paul is not afraid to make the statement "the Lord is the Spirit," he probably does not expect anyone to believe that Christ (or God, if by "the Lord" he is referring to his discussion of the Exodus 34 passage) is the Holy Spirit in any ontological sense. The exegetical key to understanding "the Lord is the Spirit" probably lies, as it does in 1 Cor 15:45 and Rom 1:3-4 (and other places), in the contrast being advanced in the passage, which in the case of 2 Corinthians 3 has to do with the Mosaic economy versus the economy of the Spirit brought by Christ and administered by Paul. The old covenant was mediated through Moses and administered by means of Moses' law; by metonymy, the old covenant can be referred to as "Moses." Likewise, the new covenant of which Christ is the inaugurator is a covenant that is spirit (i.e., spiritual) as opposed to law, and confers the Spirit (i.e., the Holy Spirit) as its means of definition and propagation. By implication, if Moses and the covenant he brings and represents is "law", Christ (not Paul) with all that he brings and represents is spirit/the Spirit.¹⁴

¹⁴ Abernathy, "Exegetical problems in 2 Corinthians 3," 53-54.

As Gaffin says, trinitarian identities and relationships are outside of Paul's view in 2 Cor 3:17; his focus is on "the conjoint *activity* of the Spirit and Christ as glorified."¹⁵ Nevertheless, in light of what he says in Rom 1:3-4 and 2 Cor 3:17, there is very definitely a connection in Paul's mind between the ministry of the Holy Spirit and the role of the resurrected Christ. As Ellis puts it, the relation between Christ and the Spirit includes both "distinction and identity, and the oscillation in terminology is reminiscent of that between Yahweh and the Spirit of Yahweh in the Old Testament."¹⁶ While not intending an ontological confusion between Christ and the Holy Spirit, Paul nevertheless implies that Christ's resurrection effects what Gaffin calls "a spiritual qualification and transformation so thorough and an endowment with the Spirit so complete that as a result they can now be equated. This unprecedented possession of the Spirit and the accompanying change in Christ result in a unity so close that not only can it be said simply that the Spirit makes alive, but also that Christ *as Spirit* makes alive."¹⁷ (Gaffin clarifies that this equating of identity is economic or functional with respect to their activity, not their ontological being.) In terms of the efficacy of the covenant and their redemptive activity Christ and the Spirit are identified as one in a functional and dynamic identity.¹⁸ As Dunn puts it, "Christ is now experienced as Spirit...because the Spirit is now experienced as Christ."¹⁹

Dunn may go too far when he says that immanent Christology is for Paul pneumatology, since "in the believer's experience there is *no* distinction between Christ and Spirit," and Dunn himself readily admits that this does not mean that Paul does not distinguish

¹⁵ Gaffin, "Life-giving spirit," 584, italics mine.

¹⁶ Ellis, 273-274.

¹⁷ Gaffin, *Resurrection and Redemption*, 87.

¹⁸ Gaffin, *ibid.*, 95, 97.

¹⁹ Dunn, 141.

between Christ and the Spirit.²⁰ But the point he is making, as was noted above, is that for Paul an experience of Christ is of necessity an experience of the Holy Spirit.²¹ Christ is the *life-giving spirit*, which in 1 Cor 15:45 primarily means that he exists bodily as a human being in the spiritual realm with a spiritual or supernatural body and is able to impart the same kind of life through the Holy Spirit to those who believe in him. If he is supernaturally able to grant life to new physical bodies in the eschatological future he is also able by that same life-giving power to infuse dynamic spiritual life in the eschatological present.

Conclusion

In 1 Corinthians 15 Paul has undertaken to challenge the skewed belief about the nature of spiritual life and eschatological existence that some in Corinth held. Influenced as they were by Hellenistic culture, it was natural for some Corinthians to view bodily existence as being incompatible with spiritual existence, since body and spirit were thought to be incompatible opposites. Others had concluded that they themselves were “spiritual,” living the full spiritual, πνευματικός existence in the present life. Paul had to show them that both ideas were wrong, that there is a future existence that is both corporeal and spiritual, an existence in which we will have supernatural bodies and share the essential life of Christ himself. That life will come from Christ the second Adam, who through his resurrection not only has become alive again, existing in a spiritual body, but also has power as a life-giving spirit to impart that same life to those who trust in him. That life will be imperishable in eternity, but even now it has a dynamic and transforming quality to it that enables the believer to live a qualitatively different life in the present age.

²⁰ Dunn, 139.

²¹ Dunn, 141.

The Adam/Christ contrast in 1 Corinthians 15

	ADAM	THOSE IN ADAM	THEIR BODIES	CHRIST	THOSE IN CHRIST	THEIR BODIES
21	Death came through a man			The resurrection of the dead comes through a man		
22		All die			All will be made alive	
23				The first fruits (first to rise)	Those who belong to him (rise next)	
40			Earthly			Heavenly
42			Perishable			Imperishable
43			Buried in dishonour			Raised in glory
44			Natural			Spiritual
45	First			Last		
45	Living Soul			Life-giving spirit		
47	First			Second		
47	Of the dust of the earth			From heaven		
48	Earthly	Of the earth		From heaven	Of Heaven	
49		Born the image of the earthly man			Bear the likeness of the heavenly man	
50			Flesh and blood -- alien to heaven			
51						Will be changed
52						Raised imperishable
53			Perishable and mortal			Clothed with imperishable immortal

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abernathy, David. "Exegetical problems in 2 Corinthians 3," *Notes On Translation* 14/4, 2000, 44-56.
- "Translating 1 Peter 3:18-22." *Notes On Translation* 15/2, 2001, 28-46.
- Dunn, James D. G. "1 Corinthians 15:45 – last Adam, life-giving spirit." In *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, eds. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Ellis, E. Earl. "Christ and Spirit in 1 Corinthians." In *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, eds. Barnabas Lindars and Stephen S. Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Gaffin, Richard B. *Resurrection and Redemption: A Study in Paul's Soteriology*. (Published previously as *The Centrality of the Resurrection*.) Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1987.
- "'Life-giving spirit': Probing the center of Paul's pneumatology." *JETS* 41/4 (1998) 573-589.
- Martin, Ralph. "Approaches to New Testament exegesis." In *New Testament Interpretation*, ed. I. Howard Marshall. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.
- Moo, Douglas. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament, edited by Gordon Fee. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Exposition and Notes*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.

David Abernathy

Codex Sinaiticus Revisited

A.Q.Morton

The Codex Sinaiticus contains the only complete New Testament ante-dating the Niceaeen councils. The codex has two books not admitted in the canon and shows evidence of changes made to make other books acceptable for inclusion in the canon.

INTRODUCTION

Forty years having passed since the production of a monograph, *Contributions to the Statistical Study of the Codex Sinaiticus*, Christian Tindall, Oliver and Boyd Edinburgh, 1961, it seems appropriate to look again at some questions raised by that study.

Tindall graduated from Corpus Christ in Oxford hoping to become an archaeologist but had to enter the Indian Civil service. After 25 years of service there, ended prematurely by ill health, he retired to Devon and resumed his studies, among them the codices of the Bible, particularly the Codex Sinaiticus. He obtained an exact replica of the codex and made an intensive examination of it. He left, among his papers, notes he had made on the Sinaiticus and the monograph sought to introduce scholars to his methods and inspire them to continue his explorations.

Tindall's initial assumption was that the New Testament had been created in three stages. First, the individual books had been written, or compiled, then some of the books had been grouped, the gospels, the letters of Paul; and finally 27 had become the approved selection, the New Testament familiar to us. Each stage in this progression raises questions for scholars; how had books been created and preserved; when had they been gathered and on what principles, how had 27 been chosen and others excluded.

A key date in the history of The New Testament is 331 when the emperor Constantine ordered fifty bibles. Not only did this imply scriptoria able to produce on such a scale, it must have been agreed

what the volumes would contain. The Sinaiticus must ante-date this order. It contains two texts, the epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas which were to be excluded from the canon. There is no record of any formal decision about the contents of The New Testament. In 325 the council of Niceaea spent many days discussing the creed but when the question came up of fixing the canon of The New Testament, the assembled bishops, as Papias recounts in his Synodicon, were unable to reach agreement and “put the disputed books under the communion table of a church nearby, and prayed the Lord that those which were inspired might rise up on the table while the others remained underneath. And it happened accordingly.”

Attempts have been made to date the Sinaiticus by calligraphy, but the first examination by Tischendorf and Lake identified nine hands in the text. The expert committee who produced *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* consequent on its arrival in the British Museum reduced this to three and concluded the codex was unique and unlikely to have come from a scriptorium. Dating by calligraphy depends on having a sequence of comparable examples into which an unknown specimen can be placed. For the Sinaiticus no such sequence exists.

Tindall advanced three arguments for the Sinaiticus being much earlier than the other great Codex, the Vaticanus. Not only did it have the two books later excluded, he argued that in the Sinaiticus Mark had stood first among the gospels. For this conclusion he gave two reasons. One was the lettering. The calligraphy in Mark is good but slackens as the codex continues. With the books in order of Mark, Matthew, Luke, the sequence is smooth; the present position of Mark is anomalous. The other was a progressive narrowing of the pages, due he thought to using each sheet as a template for the next, which again is regular only when Mark is moved up into pole position. For neither of these conclusions did he adduce any evidence and they may well have been hypotheses which Tindall planned to investigate rather than the results which his notes seem to indicate.

His third argument he developed in a simple form. The Sinaiticus is based on a text which antedates the version which was to become

accepted. He assumed that some features of the manuscript showed insertions and excisions had been made, changes larger than the differences to be expected in the course of simply copying a manuscript. Tindall started from a reasonable assumption that writing is subject to natural variations and would have a predictable pattern. Most columns will contain a number of letters near to the average number for all columns. Departures from the average will be as likely to result in fewer letters as in more letters. Large differences will be rare and rapidly become much rarer as the difference from the average increases. He claimed that the outcome was a Normal Distribution, a pattern which enables differences to be classed as likely to be due to chance variation, or so unlikely to arise from natural variation that some alternative explanation is required. He states his conclusions, "experiments here and elsewhere indicate that changes can be represented by a normal curve of standard deviation near to 3%." This led him to believe that "columns containing 625-640 letters were due to scribal variations, columns with 641-675 were due to some other cause and columns of over 675 were almost certainly due to some other cause." He went on to identify a number of passages in the text which he supposed had been added to the exemplar of the Sinaiticus, indicating an origin before the final text of the books had been agreed.

FROM THE BEGINNING

The first question which arises is one Tindall never framed -Why squeeze large blocks into a text? If you are writing a manuscript which has 13 letters per line and 48 lines per column and want to add 260 letters, why not simply write another 20 lines in the normal way? He supplied the answer in a different context. He describes the creation of the manuscript; a pattern was laid on a prepared skin, the skin was cut to size, two vertical lines were ruled down the centre of each of the two pages created on each skin, 48 lines were marked out using these two vertical guides. So a skin provided two pages, 8 columns on each side, 16 columns when both sides are counted. More than one single skin might be folded together, like pages in a modern newspaper, to make a quire. More than five sheets in a quire is unlikely, 80 columns are not much less than the text of Mark's gospel.

In copying a manuscript of this size, different quires would be given to different scribes and so it is essential that a scribe does not extend his text past the boundary set by the quire divisions. These divisions probably played a part in finding places in a text. Before the chapter and verse markings were added by the Swiss printer Stephanus, the only guide to places in the gospels were the Eusebian canons, a cross reference system which was far from simple to use. But the knowledge of what text could be found in which quire would be a great help in examining a manuscript.

So adding matter to a text would require insertion. "To detect and delimit insertions two things are needed, first a definition of an abnormal number of letters in any column, and second a comparative expected number of letters which will enable an estimate to be made of the size of the intrusion." Tindall assumed that the average number of letters in the columns of the whole work under examination would provide the base line and the fact that variations in writing fitted a normal distribution centred on the overall average marked the limits of natural variation and indicated which differences were so large that some other explanation for them was required.

Tindall's first assumption is wrong. The columns of the Sinaiticus do not exhibit one series of observations but three. In the centre there may well be variations in writing much as he described. But at both ends of the spectrum we do not have extreme values of variation in handwriting but quite different kinds of observations. Most columns with low numbers of letters are the result of a convention that left part of a line blank after the end of a paragraph or wrote a list of virtues, or vices, as a single word on each line; or some similar feature. These are not the result of natural variations in handwriting, they are the product of a formatting convention. Similarly, columns with excessively large numbers of letters are not the result of a natural variation; they are brought about, as Tindall argues, by the insertion of new material.

So including the whole pattern of letters per column is to combine three different sources for the observations. There will be a central section which may well reflect the natural chance variations in handwriting, there will be a negative tail made up of columns with

more than average numbers of lines truncated for one reason or another, and a positive tail which does indicate intrusions

A STARTING POINT

Tindall first assumed that the average number of letters per column in the whole book, such as a gospel, was a good point from which to calculate the boundaries. Some of his later examples show that this was not a tenable assumption and he used a local average, based on a few columns adjacent to the anomalous column under examination. A more modern technique can be used to split the sequence of columns into consistent groups and the local average can be derived from these. First the pattern of columns in all four gospels and Acts needs to be looked at, this is shown in Table One.

In the table, the mean is the number of letters in all completed columns divided by the number of such columns. The median, the central value above which, and below which, half the observations lie, is calculated from the table having a cell interval of 10 letters. The range is the difference between the largest and smallest columns. A comparison of the mean and the median indicates how symmetrical the pattern is, for a single peak with similar patterns above and below, the mean and median would coincide.

It is not surprising to find Luke and Acts similar though the gospel ranges further than its companion; Mark and John are not dissimilar; Matthew, with multiple peaks differs from the others. A column with over 720 letters is clearly anomalous, having perhaps 100 letters more than the local average, but the same might be true of a column with only 660 letters. For valid comparisons, it is essential to use local averages.

Table One

No of Letters In column	Number of such columns in:				
	Matthew	Mark	Luke	Acts	John
551-560	1	1	-		1
561-570	12	2	1	1	1
571-580	12	1	1	-	6
581-590	20	-	4	1	2
591-600	15	6	15	7	8
601-610	28	7	13	3	22
611-620	22	12	26	15	20
621-630	7	20	24	23	20
631-640	12	16	23	24	14
641-650	13	8	18	24	10
651-660	3	4	11	27	1
661-670	3	3	3	13	2
671-680	1	2	5	5	
681-690		1	3	3	
691-700		-	1		
701-710		1	-		
711-720			-		

721-730	1				
Totals	139	85	149	146	107
Mean	618.8	626.9	629.6	639.0	625.9
Median	607.0	626.8	626.9	639.6	616.8
Range	115	145	163	117	110

The book contains an error, page 29 column 2 should read 637, not 37.

MATTHEW.

Table Two

Column Numbers	No of cols. in sequence	No of letters in sequence	Average no of letters per col.
1-7	7	4358	623
8-28	21	12554	598
24-31	3	1938	646
32-50	19	11729	617
51-58	8	4744	593
59-69	11	6813	619
70-80	11	7129	648
81-99	19	11531	607
100-102	3	1974	658

103-109	7	4299	614
110-118	9	5856	651
119-124	6	3636	606
125-128	4	2635	659
129-139	11	6810	619

In the Sinaiticus, Matthew fills 139 columns and has in a final column only three letters. The 139 columns contain 86006 letters, 619 letters per average column. The Sinaiticus contains 3960 letters fewer than the modern text of Alan. Black, Metzger and Wikgren. This does not imply a passage of this size has been omitted, the Sinaiticus has many contractions, the names of Jesus and God are always contracted and some others are irregularly abbreviated.

In Matthew, Tindall's primary assumption does not hold. A count of all the columns, using his figures, does not result in a Normal Distribution. Rather than the single-peaked pattern, the familiar bell-shape, it shows three peaks, a head and two shoulders. Any simple rule based on the Normal Distribution could be misleading.

Another complication which he mentions but then ignores, is that the writing gets smaller as the codex proceeds and the number of letters per column rises. So a count of 640 letters near the beginning of the text is not comparable with the same number near the end. In Matthew, columns 1 - 69 average 610.7 letters per column, columns 70 - 139, 626.7 letters per column.

The Sinaiticus was written with no spaces between words or sentences, but a new paragraph begins on a new line leaving a space averaging half a line, 6 or 7 letters wide, at each paragraph ending. In Matthew the average column has 2 such spaces but some columns have 5, one has 7, creating columns with 20 -35 letters

fewer than the overall average. There are a few instances of truncated lines which are not due to a paragraph ending, notably column 70 in which four successive lines contain only one word of 6 or 7 letters. If a low count is not due to a plenitude of truncated lines, there may be a lower limit as significant as the higher one of 640 letters.

At this point a choice must be made between two extremes, one aimed at picking out the smallest possible insertions, with a high degree of uncertainty in sizing them, the other selecting only insertions large enough to make the uncertainty negligible. Tindall began with a margin of 3% above the local mean as the limit of natural variation in handwriting. So in a column averaging 624 letters, counts up to 642 are most likely due to such natural variation. Under the impression that this was also one standard deviation of a normal distribution, he went on to assume that as much again, another 3%, up to 660 letters, was a twilight zone. At the bottom, near 642 letters, the primary cause would be natural variation, but at the top it was less likely to be an acceptable explanation. He assumed counts above 675 letters must be due to other causes than variations in handwriting.

That the range of chance variation in the writing of the Sinaiticus is 3% above and below the average seems reasonable, not because it is one standard deviation of anything but because the negative variations only exceed 3% when the number of truncated lines is more than the average number of such lines. Variations above and below the average are generally symmetrical when anomalous counts due to a surplus of truncated lines or an insertion are excluded.

So it is a reasonable assumption that counts no more than 3% above the local average are due to handwriting variations, for them no other explanation is required. This does not mean there are no insertions in the text of less than 3% of the local average, it only means that this technique cannot deal with them in a simple manner.

An inspection of the Sinaiticus shows some columns are far above the local average and, with contiguous columns, suggest insertions not of a word or two but some sentences. This is not the product of

correcting a manuscript, it is revision. If therefore attention is concentrated, at this stage, on counts of, say, 70 letters, or more, above the local average, the uncertainty due to handwriting variation becomes much less significant.

In Matthew the first major anomaly lies in columns 29 -31 which contain 1938 letters. The estimated size of the intrusion depends on which average is used in comparisons. Tindall selected some columns before and some after and arrived at an average of 620 letters per column. A more likely average is taken from the following sequence, 19 columns averaging 617 letters per column. An insertion, like a ship, leaves more disturbance after it than before it. This suggests the three columns could be expected to have 1851 letters and the addition to be 87 letters. Verse 13 of chapter 8 has 86 letters in it, and is a better conclusion than the parallel, Luke 7.10

The second sequence to house an anomaly is columns 70 -80 within which columns 73 -77 contain 3314 letters and average 663 letters per column, 3 out of the 5 columns lie above the 3% limit, the 2 others, 2 letters below it. Compared with the average of 617, derived from the previous long sequence, the additional material would run to 229 letters. It is here that Tindall suggests his major find, the enlargement in 16.18 -19, which runs to 229 letters in the printed text and is a precise match. Tindall makes the telling observation that the passage is based on the Markan narrative but exceeds it by 229 letters.

The next sequence of interest is in the three columns 100 -102 They contain 1974 letters and the adjoining sequences have an average of 614 letters per column. This suggests the 3 columns should have 1842 letters rather than the 1974 they do contain. The difference is 132 letters and 22.13 has in it 131.

The final anomaly lies in columns 125 -128. which contain 2635 letters against and expected 2476 derived from the following sequence which has an average of 619 letters per column. Column 128 is the likeliest location and in it verses 65 and 66 of chapter 26 contain 155 letters compared to the forecast 159. The high priest rending his garments is a vivid but imaginative detail..

Tindall locates some other passages in Matthew but does so by changing to counts of letters per page. This is not justified unless the pattern of all the pages has been recorded and examined. The page count in Matthew shows that the gospel is written with an increasing number of letters per page as it progresses. The first 17 pages average 2441 letters, pages 18-34 average 2511. The difference of 70 letters per page is critical, the only anomalous pages are page 8, 122 letters above the local average, page 19, 149 letters, page 29, 115 letters, and page 32, 124 letters more than the local average. All these were detected by the column count. Tindall added others by using an unrepresentative average from the first half of the text, had he used a later estimate with about 70 letters more they would not have been classed as major insertions.

The difficulties which arise with minor anomalies can be seen in two examples. Columns 1-7 make up the first sequence in Matthew. They contain 4358 letters, an average of 622.5 letters per column and range from a high of 647 to a low of 599 letters. This range of 48 letters is 7.7% of the average, more than Tindall suggested as the limit of natural variation. One column, column 5, lies above the 3% limit and when it is excluded, the remaining six columns contain 3711 letters, average 618.5, a range of 37 letters, 6.0% of the average and no column lies more than 3% below the average. Column 4 now lies precisely on the upper limit of 3%, and when it is excluded, the sequence then has 5 columns containing 3075 letters, average 615 letters and a range of 16 letters well below the 6% natural boundary.

Assuming columns 4 and 5 should have the same average content as the others, they would contain 1230 letters rather than the 1283 they have, suggesting 53 letters more have been added. In the text 2.12 has 56 letters. It recounts the departure of the wise men consequent on a warning dream, the text goes on to tell of another such dream to Mary and Joseph. Lacking 2.12 a reader may wonder what had become of the wise men and an explanatory note is welcome. But at what stage in the development of the text was it added? Was it already in place in the exemplar from which the Sinaiticus was copied? It adds one letter to each line for just over a column, not a major disturbance in the new codex.

A second instance of the difficulties in dealing with short anomalies comes in the following sequence, columns 8-28, which contain 12,554 letters an average of 597.9 letters per column. The range is from 623 down to 578, 45 letters, 7.5% of the average. Only one column, column 18, 5.29 -36 in the text, lies above the limit. When it is excluded no column lies below the average by more than 3% and column 18 has 25 letters more than the sequence average. The likely addition is the 21 letters in the three Greek words, " save for the cause of adultery", The phrase greatly weakens the statement in which it is embedded and would not come naturally from a man who had refused to condemn a woman taken in adultery. But once again the question is, at what stage in the composition of the text was it included? Adding just below half a letter in the 48 lines of a single column, will hardly leave a visible irregularity.

A number of such brief anomalies occur in the gospels but they are really best considered in a different context, as variants in the text rather than editorial insertions.

MARK

In the Sinaiticus the gospel of Mark fill 85 columns, averaging 627 letters per column. The sequence of columns is shown in Table Three

Table Three

Column Numbers	No of cols in sequence	No of letters in sequence	Average no of letters per col.
1-8	8	5062	632.8
9-49	41	25506	622.1
50-80	31	19789	638.4
81-85	5	2927	585.4

A cusum examination suggests no more than four local averages are needed to cover the whole text and few anomalies, columns 3% above the local averages of 652, 642, 657 and 603 letters. The highest count is column 80 with 708 letters, the lowest column 85 with 560. The sequences are shown in Table Three.

Column 80 has 70 letters more than the sequence average, the text is 15.6 -16 and 15.14 has 73 letters. It is inconceivable that a Roman magistrate would express this sentiment in public, but at a later time the supposition would support that the Romans had been innocent of the death of Jesus, it was due to Jewish insistence.

LUKE AND ACTS

Table Four

LUKE

Column Numbers	No of cols. in sequence	No of letters in sequence	Average no of letters per col.
1-6	6	4161	693.5
7-36	30	18975	632.5
37-58	22	13421	610.0
59-67	9	5764	640.4
68-84	17	10447	614.5
85-104	20	12915	645.8
105-113	9	5456	606.2
114-128	15	9863	645.5

129-149	21	12836	611.2
1-149	149	93658	629.58

ACTS

Column Numbers	No of cols. in sequence	No of letters in sequence	Average no of letters per col.
1-11	11	6597	599.7
12-20	9	5645	649.4
21-65	45	28455	633.0
66-146	81	52370	646.5
1-146	146	93297	639.0

Both books contain a number of minor insertions, but there is only one major one, striking not only by its isolation but its size and placing. In Luke the first six columns average 699 letters, just 70 letters more than the average column in the whole book. Within the sequence column 5 has 728 letters and, as Tindall points, out this is the highest count in the thousand columns of the Sinaiticus which have survived. Tindall argues that this page contains 435 letters more than its neighbours, the six columns 380 letters more than would six average columns. It would seem that around 400 letters have been added. Tindall suggests 1.47 -50, 228 letters with 1.51 -55, 281 letters, 509 letters in all. It seems a little large even allowing for contractions. The problem in identifying an intrusion in this chapter is the fragmentary nature of the whole. There is no shortage of candidates.

Acts shows no sign of any comparable insertion and its first sequence is one of 11 columns averaging 600 letters. Acts has 3591 letters in its first 6 columns, Luke 570 letters more. The complete annunciation Luke 1.46 -55 is 549 letters. That there is a major insertion or revision cannot be doubted but the precise passages involved will vary according to theological assumptions

JOHN

The gospel of John fills 108 complete columns and is in 5 sequences.

Table Four

Column Numbers	No of cols. in sequence	No of letters in sequence	Average no of letters per col.
1-18	18	11420	634.4
19-43	25	15287	611.5
44-53	10	6400	640.0
54-90	37	23011	621.9
91-108	18	11472	637.3

No column in the gospel has 70 letters, or more, above the local average of any sequence. The only columns above the 3% limit are no more than 22 letters above it. John has not been extensively revised for inclusion in the Sinaiticus.

A FURTHER APPLICATION

The gospels and Acts are composite works and some of the differences between sequences of columns may reflect the sources from which they were compiled. No such limitation applies to

epistles which are, or should be, compositions, all the text coming from a single source. The epistles are much shorter than the compilations and so there are far fewer columns to be compared as well as rather reduced variations to be expected. The only major revision appears to have been in the opening columns of Romans. The whole epistle fill 53 complete columns at an average of 621 letters per column, columns 1 -5 contain 3924 letters and average 659 letters per column. These figures suggest about 229 letters have been added to the text of Romans in these opening columns, 1.1-2.16. This is hardly surprising, there are texts lacking the address to Rome, and statistical studies from the earliest and simplest, Wake 1948, to the latest and most complex, Morton 1993 have shown the first two chapters to be composite.

OMISSIONS

Tindall must have encountered columns with low letter counts which were clearly due to omissions, some inadvertent and corrected by marginal notes, some passed over without comment. There is a very simple method of locating any such features. All that is needed is to mark in the modern Greek text the ending of every column in the Sinaiticus. The comparison of how many letters in the Sinaiticus have paralleled the advance of the modern text, shows up any discrepancy. Again, the modern text has more letters than the manuscript due to abbreviations being restored, again there are variations due to scribal errors and omissions running up to a word or two. Again, places where there are differences of more than seventy or a hundred letters, only can be due to deliberate omissions.

CONCLUSIONS.

The main aim of textual criticism has been the recovery of the original wording of the books which make up the New Testament. But Tindall has drawn attention to a second, and equally important, stage in the evolution of the New Testament, to the editing, or revision, which produced, sometime around the end of the third century, an approved version of the New Testament and indicated some of the changes deemed necessary to allow certain books to be admitted to the canon. The Sinaiticus alone preserves collected

texts of the gospels antedating the Nicaean conventions. In particular, Tindall isolated three major insertions in the gospel of Matthew: at 8.13, the ending of the story of the healing of the Roman centurion's servant, at 16.18-19, Peter's commission to head the church, and at 26.65-66, Jesus before the high priest. In Mark he detected one such insertion, the assertion of Jesus' innocence by Pilate, 15.14.

It may well be that a study of ecclesiastical politics at the time is at least as significant as the theological debates which shaped the collected books which became the authorised New Testament. It would seem that Rome asserted its pre-eminence by the rehabilitation of Peter by making changes in Matthew, by approving the 21st chapter added to John, by going on to construct an epistle from Pauline material, and by a similar revision of the opening sentences which created a letter from Ignatius addressed to Rome.

Tindall used very simple techniques to open up a new field of study. He showed that the mechanics of book production played a part in the formation of the texts. The author has argued this from another standpoint and has been rebuked for suggesting such a crude constraint had any role to play in the creation of scripture. But Tindall's demonstration that, in places, the boundaries of quires determined the progress of the text is something which must now be acknowledged in New Testament studies. There are some very simple illustrations. If the gospel of Mark, in the Greek text of Aland, Black, Metzger and Wikgren, 55332 letters to 16.8, is divided in quarters, each would contain 13,833 letters. None would end at a point of any significance in the text, such as the ending of a paragraph. However if the count goes to the first paragraph ending past 13,833, it stops at 13,918. Moving on another 13,833 and again carrying on to the end of the paragraph, includes 13,888 more. A third move to the paragraph ending past another 13,833, means a third portion of 13,868 letters. This would suggest Mark was divided into four parts, three of which average 13,890 letters, plus or minus 13 letters, a precision of one part in one thousand and a fourth part having 13,663 letters, 227 letters fewer. Mark, of course, has lost its ending. Could it have been about 227 letters long?

References

Wake W.C. Sentence Length Distributions of Greek Authors, *Journal of The Royal Statistical Society*, Series A. Part 3, 1957, Vol. 120, pp. 331-346

Morton A. Q. *The Authorship and Integrity of the New Testament Epistles*, Research Report, Department of Computer Science, University of Glasgow, Gen -1993 -1, 1993

The Sinaiticus is no longer in the British Museum, it is in the British Library. Photographs come from a separate company, British Museum and Library Reproductions. Their copies are smaller, dearer and not as clear as photo-copies of Tindall's copy of the Tischendorf facsimile obtainable from :-

Special Libraries and Archives

Historic Collections, University of Aberdeen King's College, ABERDEEN AB24 3SW Tel. 01224 272929. Fax 01224 273891

Myrtle Anderson-Smith, Senior Curator.

Her help is gratefully acknowledged.

A.Q.Morton

"This is my body..." (1 Corinthians 11.24)

J.C. O'Neill

For the Very Reverend John McIntyre (20 May 1916) on his 86th birthday*

This refers to a sacramental meal of bread and wine customarily celebrated by Jesus and his disciples, not to the unleavened bread of Passover. The translation of the short well-attested text as which is for you probably rests on a misunderstanding of scribal habits. The verb is a prophetic present and refers to the future meals which the disciples are implicitly told to celebrate. The true text was which is broken for you, and the clause relates to This [bread] not directly to body: "This, which is broken for you, is [to be] my body."

Anyone who begins a sentence by saying *This is...* points to something that all present can see, or conceive of, and agree about. One of the great advantages of the theory that Jesus' Last Supper with his disciples was a Passover Meal was that it provided a clear image of what the *This* was: *this* was a piece of unleavened bread broken by the father of the family and distributed to the family and guests gathered for Passover at the beginning of Nisan 15, after sundown. On the previous day, Nisan 14, all leaven had been carefully purged away and the communal Passover Lamb had been ceremonially slaughtered by the priests. That Passover Lamb roasted lay on the table for the approaching meal.

However, it is unlikely that the Last Supper could have been a Passover Meal. The Roman authorities would scarcely run the risk of crucifying Jews on the solemn first day of Unleavened Bread, Nisan 15, when no work was to be done. No prisoner would be released *after* the Passover Meal, when he might have been released one day earlier in order to celebrate the feast of release from captivity.

In addition to the tradition about the release of Barabbas (John 18.39, 40), John's Gospel preserves four traditions that date the

crucifixion on Nisan 14, the day of preparation for the Passover: Judas left the last meal, they thought to prepare for Passover (John 13.29); Jesus' Jewish accusers did not enter the Praetorium lest they be defiled and precluded from eating the Passover (John 18.28); Pilate gave his ruling on the eve of Passover, about the sixth hour (John 19.14); the *preparation* for the great day (John 19.31; cf. 19.42) was probably Nisan 14, since the not breaking of Jesus' legs was said to accord with the not breaking of the bones of the Paschal lamb (John 19.36; Ex 12.10 LXX, 46; Num 9.12).

This is supported by the tradition preserved in 1Cor 5.7 (TR): "Christ our Passover has been sacrificed for us." A similar tradition is found in the Talmud, Sanhedrin 43a: "On the preparation of the Passover Jesus was hanged."

Almost the only passage that counts against such testimony that Jesus was crucified on Nisan 14 is the confused statement in the Synoptic Gospels that "on the first day of unleavened bread, when they were sacrificing the Passover lamb, they [the disciples] said to him [Jesus], 'Where will you have us go and prepare that you may eat the Passover?'" (Mark 14.12; cf. Matt 26.17; Luke 22.7, 8). This cannot refer to Nisan 15, the true first day of Unleavened Bread, nor can it refer to Nisan 14. Finding a place to stay so that there was time for personal purification would begin much earlier; Josephus reported an occasion when the people were assembling for the Feast of Unleavened Bread on Nisan 8 (*War* 6.290). I suggest that the elliptical expression in Matthew and Mark, τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἁζύμων, meant on the first day [of the week] of [the start of the Feast of] Unleavened Bread. In Luke 22.7 we should accept the plural reading of one manuscript of the Bohairic: The *days* of Unleavened Bread arrived in which it was necessary to eat the Passover. If Nisan 14 was a Friday, the first day of that week was Nisan 9.

The *This* can hardly refer to the simple breaking of the bread by which the father of the house signalled the meal was to begin (Isa 58.7; Lam 4.4; see *BAGD* s.v. κλάω). Not every meal was afterwards celebrated with an action to recall the Last Supper. There must have existed a practice, probably a practice already followed

by Jesus and his disciples, in which on special occasions token amounts of bread and wine were acknowledged with thankfulness as gifts of God, blessed by the president, and distributed to all there assembled. *This bread* and *this cup* on the lips of Jesus must have been well-known special gifts from God at the hands of the president.

There are abundant traces of such practice long before Jesus was born. In the romance *Joseph and Aseneth* to which G.D. Kilpatrick drew attention in an important article on the Last Supper in *The Expository Times* in 1952, Joseph stands for the Messiah and Aseneth, Dinah's daughter (tall like Sarah, lovely like Rebecca, and beautiful like Rachel), stands for apostate Israel, to be purified so as to eat the blessed *bread of life* and to drink the blessed *cup of immortality* and to be anointed with the *oil of incorruption*.

Melchizedek, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine in blessing Abraham (Gen 14.18-20). David's greater son in Psalm 110 is to be High Priest after the order of Melchizedek.

At Qumran the priest is first to stretch out his hands over the first-fruits of bread and wine in the assembly of the Council of the Community (1QS 6.4-5). At the End, when God has begotten the Messiah among them, the Priest is to stretch out his hands over the first-fruits of the bread and wine (1QSa 2.11-22). If we had to choose between saying, "The Messiah slotted into the usual everyday practice of the community" and saying, "The practice when the Council of the Community was assembled looked forward to the coming of the Messiah", we should choose, I think, the second formulation.

Wisdom cried out to her children, "Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled" (Prov 9.5; cf. Eccles 9.7). Of course bread and wine stand for feasting in general, but what Wisdom offers could easily be taken as an especially solemn feast, just as what Melchizedek, Priest of the Most High God and king of Salem, brought out for Abraham would mark a special point in the relation of Israel to the Lord God.

At the Last Supper the reports give further information about what *This* is pointed to. Jesus first took bread and gave thanks. The use of the verb εὐλογεῖν, to bless, in the context of the feeding of the multitude and in the general statement about the *cup of blessing which we bless* in 1Cor 10.16 suggests that at least some of the accounts say Jesus blessed the bread, like the priest at Qumran (Matt 14.19; Mark 6.41; 8.7; Luke 9.16; Matt 26.26; Mark 14.22). Not too much needs to be made of the distinction between *giving thanks* and *blessing*, for the blessing would be the solemn announcement that God had bestowed a special favour on the company there assembled for which thanks are given, the special favour embodied in bread and wine.

Jesus then broke the bread and gave it to the disciples. Before we come to the really difficult question of what Jesus could have meant by saying "This is my body", we have to ask whether the breaking of the bread (or the pouring out of the wine) had any special significance in itself.

The Textus Receptus of 1Cor 11.24b reads, λάβετε, φάγετε: τοῦτό μου ἐστι τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλῶμενον, "Take eat; this is my body which is broken for you." However, p⁴⁶ ⲛ* A B C* 33 1739* omit both *Take eat* and the participle *broken*. The Revised Version of 1881 followed this shorter text and translated our passage as "This is my body, which is for you." Moffatt, who in his own translation had rejected the shorter text, got his way in the early printings of the Revised Standard Version: "This is my body which is broken for you" (1946), but by 1952 this had become: "This is my body which is for you."

We must note that the first hand of D (Codex Claromontanus) reads θρυπτόμενον, *broken* in pieces (cf. Isa 58.7 LXX διὰθρυπτε... τὸν ἄρτον). The text of p⁴⁶ ⲛ A B C at Luke 22.19 and the Coptic here have διδόμενον, *given*.

We have two versions of the short text to consider. In p⁴⁶ we read τοῦτό ἐστίν μου τὸ σῶμα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. The text now usually

printed is slightly longer and slightly different in order: τοῦτό μου ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (8* A B C* 6 33 1739*).

There are some good parallels to the shortest text of p⁴⁶ in the LXX. Compare the ellipse in 2Macc 1.26: πρόσδεξαι τὴν θυσίαν ὑπὲρ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ, which seems to mean, Receive the sacrifice [offered] for all your people Israel. In Isa 43.3 the Lord God says, ἐποίησά σου ἄλλαγμα Αἴγυπτον καὶ Αἰθιοπίαν καὶ Σοήνην ὑπὲρ σοῦ, I have made Egypt and Ethiopia your ransom and [have given] Soene for you. The ellipses are easily filled out according to the models of Sir 29.15 χαρίτας ἐγγύου μὴ ἐπιλάβῃ: ἔδωκεν γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ σοῦ, Do not neglect the kindnesses of your guarantor, for he has given his life for you; Isa 43.4 καὶ δώσω ἀνθρώπους πολλοὺς ὑπὲρ σοῦ καὶ ἄρχοντας ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς σου, and I will give many men for you and rulers for your head; and 1Macc 7.33 τὴν ὁλοκαύτως τὴν προσφερομένην ὑπὲρ τοῦ βασιλέως, the holocaust being offered for the king.

For the longer short text τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν three or four rough parallels may help us. In 2Cor 7.12 Paul speaks of τὴν σπουδὴν ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, your zeal for us. In 2Cor 9.3 he recalls τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, our boasting about you. In Col 1.24 according to the Textus Receptus he writes νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, Now I rejoice in my sufferings for you. See also 1Cor 4.17 τὰς ὁδοὺς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (cf. Rom 16.3; Phlm 23; Rom 16.8; 1Cor 9.18; Col 2.1).

Notice that in all these cases the word *my* or *our* always comes between the first noun and the modifying phrase or clause. In 1Cor 11.24 the *my* comes before the word for *body*: τοῦτό μου ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

What distinguishes 1Cor 11.24 from all these examples is that the first noun does not express a verbal idea. In the examples just given the Corinthians *show* zeal towards Paul; Paul *boasts* of them, or

suffers for the Colossians; the ways *are followed* because of Christ Jesus. In 1Cor 11.24 the word *body* does not obviously carry a verbal idea. Consequently, a verbal idea has to be supplied in order to make sense of the construction. The body must be *broken* for you or *given* for you. It follows that a scribe who left the sentence without a participle would assume that the president of the eucharist would silently or out loud supply the requisite verb according to local usage: κλώμενον or θρυπτόμενον or διδόμενον. 1Cor 11.23-32 is pretty clearly a passage claiming to be from an apostle who was present on the night Jesus was betrayed giving instructions as to how the eucharist was to be celebrated. This section seems to have been inserted into Paul's instructions about unseemly love-feasts. It is a standard liturgical text, not an occasional remark of Paul's.

That suggests that the textual transmission of this passage, which dealt directly with the weekly eucharists of early congregations, may be governed by different norms from the norms governing most of the rest of the epistle.

The short text now printed in our Greek New Testaments may represent a scribal convention to leave blank what had to be provided out of local usage. The blank, however, clearly implied that a verb needed to be supplied. The English translation, "This is my body which is for you" is quite misleading, for the elliptical sentence necessarily required a participle to be understood. As John McIntyre has reminded us, no liturgical text omits a participle at this point and to do so now, at the behest of textual critics who believe p⁴⁶ & B to be infallible and who do not understand the assumption of the early scribes that a participle would be implied, is nothing less than "liturgical vandalism".

Of course there was one further reason for omitting the verb κλώμενον. The verb κλάω means *I break* or *I snap off*; often of bread, but also of arrows made of reed &c. Jesus' body, according to the tradition preserved in John 19.31-37 (with an allusion to Ex 12.46; Num 9.12; Psalm 34.20), was left whole, without his legs' being broken. I suppose Jesus may have expected his legs to be broken as the last merciful release at the end of the process of

crucifixion, but that is unlikely, for it was the death and not the possible means of death that was the way to salvation for those who revered the martyr.

If the original text lacked a participle, no one is likely to have added κλώμενον, in view of the tradition that none of his bones was broken. Desite the strong support for the shorter reading, it is not impossible that educated scribes, observing the two or three different participles that were present in their textual tradition, felt justified in suspecting that all additions were early glosses. I have long suspected that the educated scribes who eventually brought order into the chaotic readings available in a host of manuscripts worked by the rules "Prefer the shorter reading" and "Prefer the harder reading." We can detect that they worked by rules because sometimes the rules led them into error. Perhaps we may now surmise that these two rules combined to suggest a third: "When in doubt, leave out." For another example, see Matt 19.3. Matt 19.3 in \aleph^* B L Γ 579 1424* reads εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀπολύσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν; and omits any of the possible words placed between the two verbs by other early texts: ἀνθρώπω \aleph^2 C D W Θ 087 fam 1 fam 13 33 TR; ἀνθρωπον 472; ἀνθρώπων τινί 565; τινί 700; ἀνδρί 4 273 1424^c. This very hard elliptical sentence must have been understood to mean, "Is it lawful *for a man* to put away his wife for every cause?", the translation given in the Revised Version of 1881, putting in italics the words the Revisers had to supply, since they were following the short text printed by Westcott and Hort (and later, by von Soden).

Of the two short texts, that of p⁴⁶ which lacks an article before ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and that of \aleph^* B which has an article before ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, which is to be preferred? Both short texts imply a participle, and we have shown that the shorter text is likely to have implied *given* or *offered*, on the model of a number of examples from the LXX. The harder reading is probably the reading with an article before ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, since it does not follow the LXX model. We have seen that educated scribes engaged in the work of constructing a standard text on the basis of a number of varying manuscripts could have decided to omit a participle on the grounds

that omission was the safest course when confronted by three possible participles. Since no scribe is likely to have inserted the difficult participle κλώμενον, the true original text is likely to be τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον. The changing of κλώμενον into θρυπτόμενον or διδόμενον opened the way for clever editors to omit a participle altogether.

Now we must note that κλάω is otherwise always used with *bread* in our literature. Recall, also, that the word *my* stands in the wrong position for providing an easy transition from *my body* to *which is broken for you*.

The solution seems to be that the clause τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον goes with τοῦτό ... ἐστίν not with ... μου ... τὸ σῶμα: "This, which is broken for you, is my body."

Look at two verses in 1John that display this construction. First, 1John 2.22b: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν, This is the Antichrist, the one who denies the Father and the Son. There are not many antichrists, one of whom denies the Father and the Son. Then 1John 5.4, where both constructions are present: αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ νίκη ἡ νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον, ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν, This is the victory that is victorious over the world, our faith. The final phrase ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν goes with αὕτη ...

There is another example in the eucharistic texts. Luke 22.20b reads: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον. This is sometimes translated (on the argument that the participle agrees in sense with *blood*, in grammar with *cup*), "This cup is the new covenant in my blood which will be poured out for you" (Jerusalem Bible), but the RSV footnote keeps to the strict grammar: "This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood." The τό in the final clause agrees in sense and in grammar with τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον, not with τῷ αἵματί μου.

The hardest part of all. What could Jesus of Nazareth, a Jewish Rabbi with twelve disciples, presiding at a ritual meal in which he prayed, blessed and broke bread; prayed, blessed and poured out wine for his disciples, have meant by "This is my body"?

He was restricted in what he could say. He obviously held himself to be the Messiah, and his disciples held him to be such. Many of the people held him to be the Messiah, and so did one of the thieves crucified with him. His enemies held him to be a messianic pretender. Nevertheless, he was forbidden to say he was the Messiah or even to hint in words that he was the Messiah; that, according to Jewish Law, would have been blasphemy. John 19.7: "We have a law and according to our law he ought to die because he made himself [i.e. he explicitly claimed to be] the Son of God" (which is a title of the Messiah).

So what could Jesus have meant by solemnly announcing a few days before Passover, on the eve of the day when he was likely to be crucified, "This bread which is broken for you is my body"?

First, we have to modify the translation to bring out the fact that the present tense *is* refers to the future: This bread is to be my body. The original Hebrew or Aramaic sentence would not have had a verb expressed, but we still need to make sense of the present tense of the verb *to be* which the earliest translators of the Hebrew or Aramaic traditional account made in Greek. Jesus is unlikely to have identified the bread which he then blessed, broke, and gave to the disciples on that occasion as his body. The word *body* implies his crucified body, regarded as a sacrifice. The words look ahead to his imminent death and imply that, when Jesus is no longer present to preside, the disciples will have to continue these sacramental meals. Then the bread will be the body of their martyred Lord. The present tense can operate as a prophetic present, as in Matt 27.63; Mark 9.31. The verb *to be* in the present seems to be prophetic in Matt 5.3; 18.4; 19.14; 22.42.

There is no difficulty about things standing for the body and blood of a person. David refused to drink the water that three of his soldiers brought to him in the cave of Adullam. They had risked their lives to draw from the well of Bethlehem that is at the gate

when Bethlehem was garrisoned by the Philistines, simply because David had expressed a longing to drink from it. David would not drink of it but poured it out to the Lord. "Shall I drink the blood of these men that have put their lives in jeopardy?" (2Sam 23.13-17; 1Chron 11.15-19).

There was a tradition that the Rock that gave water to the desert generation during the Exodus was Christ (1Cor 10.4;cf. John 4.14). The stone in Dan 2 that crushed God's enemies was interpreted as the Messiah. (Matt 21.44 & B; Luke 20.18; Josephus *Antiquities* 10.210; 2Esdras (4Ezra) 13.6-11, 36-38).

Wisdom can say, "Those who eat me will hunger for more, and those who drink me will thirst for more" (Sir 24.21), and some such tradition lies behind the words given to Jesus in John's Gospel: "I am the bread of life" (John 6.35, 48, 51; cf. 6.33).

In saying the words "This is to be my body" Jesus must have said something any righteous martyr in Israel could have said (although of course he could not *deny* he was Messiah, and he was free to do things like feeding crowds in the desert and riding into Jerusalem on a donkey that fitted the role of the expected Messiah).

We have a report of Eleazar's prayer as he was martyred under Antiochus Epiphanes in 4Macc 7.27-29: "You know, O God, that though I might have saved myself, I am dying in burning torments for the sake of the law. Be merciful to your people, and let our punishment suffice for them. Make my blood their purification, and take my life in exchange for theirs." Eleazar wanted Israel to repent and to plead his blood before God for their purification.

It seems that Jesus' words to his disciples on the night on which he was betrayed were doing two things.

First, they were announcing that their master was about to be crucified. Secondly, they were instructing the disciples to continue the practice of gathering together, with one of them presiding, in order to tell others that Jesus' crucified body brought benefits that could be received by worthily eating the ritually broken bread.

This reading of the words is preserved in the dogmatic sentence found in 1Cor 10.16b: τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; The bread which we break, is it not participation in the body of Christ? Note that this verse helps confirm our reading of 1Cor 11.24b: This bread which we break... The same verb is used: τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν.

Although Jesus never claimed to be the heavenly Son of Man, he was not forbidden to act in a way which fitted the traditions about the Son of Man. Such an ancient tradition was recalled by Jesus in John 1.51: ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεωγόμενον καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, Amen, amen I say to you, you will see heaven opened and the angels of God ascending and descending [on the ladder resting on] the Son of Man. The reference is to Jacob's dream. He made a stone his pillow and dreamt he saw angels ascending and descending on a ladder reaching to heaven. Next morning he set up the stone and anointed it. The stone was Christ (Justin Dialogue 86; cf. 58; 126).

The stone of Bethel was also the holy stone God made before he made the world (Yalqut Gen 120 [on Gen 28.22] &c.). Bethel was also taken as the site of the Temple in Jerusalem in the Targums, and this is confirmed by 11QTemple Scroll 29.8-11 (cf. TLevi 9.3).

The rock at Bethel was then the place of sacrifice. From there prayers went up to heaven, borne by angels, and the angels returned with beneficent answers (Origen, *contra Celsum* 5.4).

If Jesus had this tradition in his mind at the Last Supper, we may surmise that he was instructing his disciples to pray over and break bread, his body, so that that bread would be taken to heaven and brought back as manna, the bread of angels, to feed his people (Neh 9.15; Ps 105.40; LXX 2Esdras 19.15 for *bread of heaven*; and Ps 78.25 (cf. 103.20) for *bread of angels*).

The Lord Jesus on the night on which he was betrayed took bread and having given thanks [of course with eyes open and looking up] broke [the bread] and said, This which is broken for you is to be my

body. Do this that God may remember [my death as a sacrifice offered to him that you and others who gather in worship may receive at the hands of angels the bread of heaven].

Works Referred To

Kilpatrick, G. D. "The Last Supper." *ExpT* 64 (1952-53), 4-8.

The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy: The Moorhouse Lectures 1975. Cambridge: CUP. 1983.

McIntyre, John. *The Shape of Soteriology: Studies in the Doctrine of the Death of Christ.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark. 1992.

O'Neill, J.C. "The Rules Followed by the Editors of the Text Found in the Codex Vaticanus." *NTS* 35 (1989), 219-228.

"What is *Joseph and Aseneth* about?" *Henoch* 16 (1994), 189-198.

"Bread and Wine." *SJT* (48 (1995), 169-184.

J. C. O'Neill
9 Lonsdale Terrace
Edinburgh EH3 9HN
United Kingdom
e-mail: joneill@ed.Acts.uk.

The Divine Drama: The Old Testament as Literature, The Lutterworth Press, Cambridge, 2001, pp800 (pbk)

It is always interesting to read a book on the Old Testament written by someone who is not first and foremost a professional biblical scholar. John Dancy, the author of this hefty volume, is a classicist by training, with an illustrious career both in schools and in higher education culminating as Principal of St Luke's College of Education and Professor of Education at Exeter University. Although he has previously written on I Maccabees and other books of this Apocrypha this project is described as his 'life's work.'

The book contains extracts from the Old Testament – about 30% of the Old Testament and 15% of the Apocrypha are printed out using a considerable variety of translations – and commentary notes which, according to the author, are written primarily from the standpoint of literary criticism. There are also introductions and appendices exploring the nature of Hebrew story-telling and Hebrew poetry, the history and archaeology of Israel and the Ancient Near Eastern context of the material. It is intended for the non-specialist – the 'general educated public'.

The volume shows both the benefits and disadvantages of its provenance. It is refreshing to have links and connections drawn to the classical world of ancient Greece – an important but often forgotten reminder of the interconnectedness of the eastern Mediterranean. Dancy's reflections however range even wider – pointing us at times in the direction of Arabic literature and 20th century analogies where appropriate. He has wide sympathies and truly humane views.

But it also feels slightly 'dated' in its approach. For example, the author seems to have ignored recent discussion about the sources and dating of the Pentateuch. He also seems to be influenced by the now (generally questioned) view that seeks to link specific patriarchal customs to practices prevalent in regions of the ancient Middle East such as Nuzi during the second millennium BC.

There is a deeper unease about the enterprise. It is the principle of selectivity that Dancy employs. Even though the book contains 800

pages there are some parts of the Old Testament that are clearly underrepresented. Dancy makes no bones about this: his basic criteria for inclusion is 'whether such and such a passage is capable of holding the attention of the general educated reader'. (p.11) A lot of space in the book is taken up with actual scriptural extracts – using a considerable variety of translations, with the author himself selecting which translation to use for which passage – something that adds to the uneven quality of the volume. As a result some books are barely represented in the work at all (e.g. Leviticus) and others are completely omitted (e.g. 1 and 2 Chronicles – presumably because they are felt to repeat Samuel and Kings!). It ends up feeling a rather Protestant Old Testament which is presented to us – in spite of the inclusion of some purple passages from the Apocrypha! But there are two other consequences to this approach – even within books that are more extensively represented in this 'canon'. First that at times the author's selection betrays a fairly deep antipathy to parts of Old Testament life and spirituality that many modern scholars – and educated readers – find significant. For example in the selection from the Book of Psalms we are told by Dancy that he has deliberately cut the proportion of the psalms of lament 'because in our eyes they quickly become tedious' (p.414) and, apparently, because in the Christian religion laments have largely been replaced by the confession of sins. How different an approach from such as Walter Brueggemann who regrets the 'costly loss of lament' in Christian spirituality. Yet in truth one cannot really understand the world of Old Testament spirituality unless one is prepared to wrestle with the important part that lament plays within it.

Secondly – and interestingly in a work with a subtitle 'The Old Testament as Literature' – such a selective approach inevitably means that it is difficult to appreciate the way in which whole biblical books – or significant sections within them actually function as literature. This affects books both small and longer – it is difficult to fully appreciate the parodies of Jonah with chapter 2 omitted, for example, or to understand the interplay in the five sections of the Book of Psalms with so many psalms not included.

Perhaps Dancy is more aware of these problems than he lets on: this is the only book on biblical studies I have read recently which

actually contains a chapter (Appendix C) which is written specifically to answer objections to the whole enterprise!

Clare Amos

United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel
London

James R. Nieman and Thomas G. Rogers, *Preaching to Every Pew: Cross-Cultural Strategies*. (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001).

No less a figure than that giant of preaching theory, Professor Tom Long of Emory University, declares on the cover that 'we have been desperately needing this book for a long time.' The subject is preaching to congregations made up of a diversity of races, classes and religious convictions. The book deals with the American context, but in Europe also our congregations are no longer homogeneous. How can the preacher proclaim the good news with sensitivity to such a gathering? How can the gospel be communicated and the danger of misunderstanding be avoided?

Nieman and Rogers see four areas where preachers should be aware of the cross-cultural nature of their work. The first two, ethnicity and class are obvious. However the third is one we may miss, displacement, i.e. those people who have been uprooted from their true home and seek in worship some kind of return there or some kind of comfort in exile. The fourth area is that of belief, where congregations may have had religious experience that is different from that of the preacher or even religious experience that is rooted in the world view of a non-Christian religion.

The book is based on interviews with many preachers who minister in cross-cultural settings. Their insights can be summed up in one sub-heading 'Choosing Our Words Carefully.' Moreover, the theology of the whole book is contained in the attempt to answer the question posed by the lawyer in Luke chapter ten and verse twenty-nine, 'And who is my neighbour?' The example of our Lord himself is set before the preacher right at the beginning of this study.

‘If Christ proved to be our ultimate neighbour in his self-emptying love on the cross, what does that imply for those who dare to gather as the body of Christ? The image of the neighbour in a multicultural America thus raises a challenge not only to our preaching, but to our very identity as church.’ [page 14]

Nieman and Rogers highlight the kind of knowledge that a preacher can only gain in the course of a sensitive and caring pastoral ministry. For example Vietnamese people, whose staple diet is rice, do not understand bread as a source of basic sustenance, but only as frivolous pastry. A preacher expounding ‘the Bread of Life’ should take note. Native Americans, hearing of the Children of Israel arriving to conquer the Promised Land, tend to identify with the Canaanites. It is surely necessary for all of us preachers to imitate that minister in a cross-cultural setting who proclaimed the transcendence of Christ over all other allegiance when he stated plainly, ‘to be Christian doesn’t mean to be American.’

Preaching to people traumatised by displacement from their true home can benefit from using Bible examples of foreigners in a hostile country. There is Abram setting out without knowing his destination; there is the Canaanite woman in Matthew chapter fifteen, the Good Samaritan, the woman at the well and our Lord himself who had nowhere to lay his head. One preacher in a congregation of exiles claims that Christ’s suffering as a source of abundant life means much to displaced people.

The authors point out how people from other cultures rely on stories more than our ‘Anglo’ culture does. One Native American congregation even called the sermon ‘Story Time.’ But in fact all peoples respond to stories. David Buttrick in his seminal work ‘Homiletic: Moves and Structures’ devotes much space to the techniques of narrative preaching. Eugene Lowry in ‘The Homiletical Plot’ suggests that even sermons on non-narrative passages of scripture can be given a narrative structure. It is not only Asians and Native Americans who respond to the story; we all do.

Moreover the book has a serious defect. Although it is a book about preaching, it contains no sermons and only one sermon extract. The interviews with preachers who have experienced cross-cultural preaching tell us what the preachers *think* they are doing in their sermons. But there are no sermons for us to read in order to see how this works in practice. Of course the sermon on a printed page is a poor representative of the event of preaching to a congregation in the context of worship. But how else other than by printing sermons can the reader experience what is preached?

Perhaps the greatest value of this book is in its outlining of the theology of the neighbour as the basis for cross-cultural witness of any kind.

Denis Campbell